


# Residential Care Facility Occupancy and Bed Need Summary By County September 10, 2004



This information is provided to identify quarterly occupancy rates and potential bed need by county.

**The Residential Care Facility bed need for a specific site and location within a county MUST be individually calculated using the MHFRC approved population, adjusted for zip codes wholly or partially in a 15-mile radius of the proposed site.**

The enclosed information is compiled from Division of Senior Services and Regulation (DSSR) Quarterly Survey Reports (quarters ending September 30, 2003, December 31, 2003, March 31, 2004, and June 30, 2004) plus Certificate of Need Program (CONP) population-based need data, and is current for each county as of the date of this report. Calculations are for this date of release only and will probably change.

**This report in no way promises a Certificate of Need.**

# Residential Care Facility Occupancy and Bed Need Summary By County

County	Second Qtr. 2004 Availability**		Average Occupancy***				Inventory of RCF Beds				Year 2005 Net Need by Co****
	Lic.	Avail.	3rd Qtr '03	4th Qtr '03	1st Qtr '04	2nd Qtr '04	RCF II	RCF I	CON App	Total	
Adair	110	95	82.2%	78.7%	79.2%	80.0%	110	0	0	110	-61
Andrew	17	17	82.4%	69.4%	64.7%	64.0%	17	0	0	17	23
Atchison	3	3		33.3%	33.3%	14.3%	0	0	0	0	22
Audrain	162	152	79.8%	77.2%	77.5%	74.5%	138	24	0	162	-90
Barry	149	135	77.2%	79.9%	79.4%	76.0%	85	64	0	149	-48
Barton	69	37	78.7%	61.5%	68.0%	69.1%	57	12	0	69	-35
Bates	81	47	60.1%	63.3%	78.7%	92.0%	57	24	0	81	-32
Benton	59	59	67.8%	71.1%	72.7%	74.9%	35	24	0	59	12
Bollinger	148	146	88.5%	88.0%	73.8%	77.8%	68	80	2	150	-118
Boone	404	380	79.3%	82.1%	80.9%	79.6%	298	106	100	504	-299
Buchanan	629	484	92.6%	95.5%	87.9%	87.8%	405	137	3	545	-350
Butler	265	225	90.5%	88.0%	84.6%	87.6%	96	157	0	253	-142
Caldwell	24	24	47.0%	49.2%	49.1%	56.6%	24	0	0	24	4
Callaway	288	222	77.1%	74.9%	71.6%	73.5%	264	24	0	288	-207
Camden	12	12	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	12	0	12	110
Cape Girardeau	589	572	78.4%	79.3%	74.4%	74.8%	517	72	0	589	-432
Carroll	12	12	52.2%	45.4%	43.1%	30.6%	0	12	0	12	20
Carter	57	57	61.4%	61.4%	59.6%	59.6%	45	12	0	57	-38
Cass	287	208	70.7%	73.0%	68.9%	77.3%	251	36	0	287	-101
Cedar	72	66	79.3%	78.8%	77.9%	77.9%	0	72	0	72	-20
Chariton	23	22	94.5%	95.5%	91.1%	85.6%	11	12	0	23	4
Christian	472	447	75.7%	73.9%	73.4%	73.1%	334	138	12	484	-382
Clark	22	22	66.7%	68.2%	58.3%	53.9%	22	0	0	22	-4
Clay	577	518	87.1%	88.5%	84.0%	85.7%	407	156	7	570	-191
Clinton	40	24	82.1%	74.7%	67.2%	60.7%	0	0	0	0	51
Cole	334	262	94.3%	94.3%	90.6%	88.5%	194	140	0	334	-175
Cooper	29	23	88.1%	80.3%	90.9%	89.3%	17	12	0	29	13
Crawford	170	162	80.3%	83.1%	82.1%	84.6%	60	110	25	195	-128
Dade	48	43	69.7%	74.4%	63.8%	65.8%	48	0	0	48	-21
Dallas	71	68	91.5%	85.5%	83.2%	84.3%	39	32	0	71	-28
Daviess*		0					0	0	0	0	22
Dekalb	100	100	49.2%	49.4%	59.9%	59.4%	76	24	0	100	-72
Dent	47	47	80.2%	72.9%	73.1%	74.8%	35	12	0	47	-1
Douglas	40	36	91.2%	93.2%	97.9%	100.0%	40	0	0	40	-3
Dunklin	109	95	98.3%	98.9%	98.3%	98.9%	109	0	40	149	-59
Franklin	210	156	83.9%	82.1%	72.1%	65.1%	134	76	88	298	-97
Gasconade	90	57	57.7%	49.9%	62.8%	44.7%	19	71	20	110	-66
Gentry	12	10	29.9%	20.1%	19.8%	0.0%	0	12	0	12	12
Greene	770	668	85.2%	84.8%	82.7%	82.4%	540	230	13	783	-220
Grundy	54	54	90.3%	89.9%	92.7%	88.7%	30	24	0	54	-20
Harrison	36	36	99.5%	94.5%	100.0%	96.1%	24	12	0	36	-5
Henry	124	107	79.4%	79.3%	83.0%	83.3%	42	82	0	124	-53
Hickory*		0					0	0	0	0	46
Holt*		0					0	0	0	0	15
Howard	131	113	78.6%	74.2%	75.5%	71.9%	79	52	0	131	-103
Howell	189	169	77.5%	74.1%	80.7%	80.7%	172	17	12	201	-94

# Residential Care Facility Occupancy and Bed Need Summary By County

County	Second Qtr. 2004 Availability**		Average Occupancy***				Inventory of RCF Beds				Year 2005 Net Need by Co****
	Lic.	Avail.	3rd Qtr '03	4th Qtr '03	1st Qtr '04	2nd Qtr '04	RCF II	RCF I	CON App	Total	
Iron	215	209	71.9%	74.4%	79.1%	75.2%	65	150	21	236	-204
Jackson	1,803	1,694	73.7%	76.3%	74.4%	74.7%	1,253	520	72	1,845	-465
Jasper	555	441	69.1%	77.7%	77.6%	75.0%	409	146	67	622	-375
Jefferson	725	688	77.1%	79.0%	76.5%	74.8%	431	294	4	729	-411
Johnson	154	145	56.9%	61.6%	58.1%	60.0%	126	44	0	170	-85
Knox	71	68	80.4%	81.1%	88.7%	90.9%	71	0	0	71	-58
Laclede	267	266	67.2%	65.4%	56.2%	65.6%	150	117	12	279	-205
Lafayette	124	97	70.0%	69.9%	69.7%	65.6%	59	65	0	124	-43
Lawrence	199	197	48.5%	49.1%	51.0%	51.9%	71	128	0	199	-109
Lewis	44	24	51.5%	56.8%	45.2%	47.2%	24	20	0	44	-16
Lincoln	213	198	84.7%	83.0%	77.4%	82.6%	121	92	19	232	-172
Linn	68	68	45.6%	45.1%	48.7%	50.2%	44	24	0	68	-22
Livingston	160	147	91.9%	85.1%	87.6%	84.0%	148	12	0	160	-118
Macon	36	36	82.0%	82.5%	76.2%	70.8%	24	12	0	36	11
Madison	43	43	93.0%	99.2%	99.7%	100.0%	43	0	0	43	-11
Maries	44	44	34.1%	30.5%	37.5%	54.9%	0	44	0	44	-21
Marion	209	206	88.4%	89.2%	87.5%	83.1%	119	90	0	209	-139
McDonald	57	57	62.8%	64.8%	63.1%	64.9%	57	0	0	57	-10
Mercer	38	37	88.9%	87.8%	87.2%	85.5%	26	12	0	38	-20
Miller	127	96	81.5%	94.3%	86.6%	83.0%	62	65	0	127	-72
Mississippi*		0					0	0	0	0	31
Moniteau	90	73	43.9%	43.7%	42.1%	42.7%	66	24	0	90	-55
Monroe	52	47	59.6%	60.4%	61.7%	61.1%	40	12	0	52	-26
Montgomery	81	80	45.3%	47.4%	43.8%	53.0%	69	12	0	81	-45
Morgan	134	134	66.3%	67.8%	63.4%	63.5%	110	24	0	134	-65
New Madrid	12	12	29.3%	26.4%	27.0%	27.1%	12	0	0	12	32
Newton	186	154	76.3%	75.6%	80.2%	77.8%	79	107	2	188	-73
Nodaway	83	71	70.7%	70.8%	68.2%	65.3%	41	32	0	73	-24
Oregon	33	33	97.0%	95.0%	89.9%	95.2%	33	0	0	33	-1
Osage	80	75	84.2%	72.4%	67.1%	63.2%	28	52	0	80	-50
Ozark	16	16	35.9%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	0	16	0	16	25
Pemiscot*		0					0	0	0	0	45
Perry	112	91	85.0%	82.8%	76.8%	78.7%	112	0	54	166	-117
Pettis	324	244	73.1%	65.6%	63.3%	75.8%	116	224	0	340	-247
Phelps	189	170	87.7%	87.6%	85.0%	86.9%	143	46	0	189	-79
Pike	68	64	71.5%	70.4%	67.6%	72.6%	24	44	0	68	-18
Platte	235	225	58.9%	65.0%	69.7%	76.2%	158	77	0	235	-115
Polk	146	160	85.9%	85.8%	84.9%	84.3%	146	20	0	166	-92
Pulaski	32	21	86.9%	90.7%	90.5%	89.8%	32	0	0	32	4
Putnam	12	12	91.7%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	0	12	0	12	7
Ralls	16	16	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	16	0	0	16	7
Randolph	127	110	83.7%	83.0%	81.2%	80.9%	67	60	0	127	-73
Ray	24	24	88.8%	87.7%	85.8%	65.3%	24	0	0	24	29
Reynolds	16	16	89.5%	91.3%	91.7%	85.4%	0	16	0	16	5
Ripley	66	60	72.8%	74.6%	81.2%	77.0%	66	0	0	66	-23
Saline	224	184	83.6%	87.2%	88.9%	85.5%	169	55	0	224	-165

# Residential Care Facility Occupancy and Bed Need Summary By County

County	Second Qtr. 2004 Availability**		Average Occupancy***				Inventory of RCF Beds				Year 2005 Net Need by Co****
	Lic.	Avail.	3rd Qtr '03	4th Qtr '03	1st Qtr '04	2nd Qtr '04	RCF II	RCF I	CON App	Total	
Schuyler*		0					0	0	0	0	14
Scotland	28	28	42.5%	44.1%	53.1%	43.6%	28	0	0	28	-12
Scott	148	130	82.7%	95.9%	92.4%	88.4%	106	42	43	191	-97
Shannon	23	23	73.9%	65.2%	69.6%	65.2%	0	23	0	23	0
Shelby	68	61	31.5%	27.4%	31.4%	31.0%	0	68	0	68	-47
St Charles	548	418	94.9%	93.2%	90.9%	90.2%	470	78	76	624	-200
St Clair	24	24	63.4%	62.8%	62.0%	56.0%	24	0	0	24	12
St Francois	881	798	77.7%	74.9%	73.8%	74.1%	536	378	32	946	-800
St Louis	3,009	2,442	77.1%	74.7%	74.5%	76.9%	2,504	310	31	2,845	-492
St Louis City	1,467	1,261	79.5%	79.2%	79.7%	79.3%	931	536	111	1,578	-987
Ste Genevieve	179	156	85.5%	87.5%	88.0%	89.1%	153	30	0	183	-137
Stoddard	213	210	81.7%	77.8%	76.3%	75.8%	189	24	0	213	-131
Stone	94	77	76.2%	75.6%	75.6%	79.0%	66	28	0	94	21
Sullivan	29	29	86.8%	91.0%	87.8%	86.9%	0	29	0	29	-5
Taney	125	125	88.8%	90.1%	88.7%	88.9%	78	47	66	191	-53
Texas	86	86	70.7%	73.6%	73.4%	73.6%	74	12	43	129	-67
Vernnon	20	20	76.6%	88.3%	98.4%	100.0%	20	0	2	22	-22
Vernon	178	76	76.1%	69.0%	69.6%	73.7%	114	64	0	178	-132
Warren	46	12	76.2%	70.0%	89.8%	84.5%	0	12	0	12	46
Washington	68	58	52.3%	74.0%	83.5%	81.8%	54	14	0	68	-22
Wayne	46	46	73.4%	76.9%	80.5%	55.4%	27	19	9	55	-9
Webster	74	68	76.2%	75.8%	76.4%	68.6%	64	10	0	74	-6
Worth	37	32	100.0%	95.0%	91.8%	40.5%	17	20	0	37	-28
Wright	34	34	80.1%	78.1%	77.3%	77.9%	34	0	0	34	24
<b>MISSOURI</b>	<b>22,070</b>	<b>19,259</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>77.7%</b>	<b>76.5%</b>	<b>76.8%</b>	<b>15,242</b>	<b>6,492</b>	<b>986</b>	<b>22,720</b>	<b>-10,099</b>

\*\*\*\*\*

**COMPILED BY:** Certificate of Need Program, Department of Health and Senior Services.

\* No beds were licensed in these counties during the survey period.

\*\* Licensed and available beds as reported on the last Division of Senior Services and Regulation (DSSR) survey, whereas the inventory of beds reflects the current DSSR/CONP data which may be different than the DSSR survey due to license changes.

\*\*\* The population-based number is the maximum bed need (\*\*\*\* is the "cap").

Occupancy Rates are based on actual utilization of existing licensed and available beds in each county reported by residential care facilities on Quarterly DSSR Surveys released on December 12, 2003; March 29, 2004; June 14, 2004; and September 7, 2004.

\*\*\*\* Year 2005 projected net need is based on projections of the population age 65 and over of each county for the year 2005 (as estimated by the State Demographer) multiplied by a bed need rate of 0.016 minus the current total supply of licensed and CON approved beds.

\*\*\*\*\* Available beds include 64 "sold" beds that must be shown as "licensed and available" for two years following the date they were closed, but are actually not licensed or available for occupancy, thus reducing "available" beds to 19,195, and resulting in 2,875 "unavailable" beds.